

Serial No.: 09/739,714
Art Unit: 2127

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 14 remain in this application. Of these claims, claims 1 and 9 are independent claims.

Claims 1 and 4-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,841,763 to Leondires et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,709,344 to Crawford in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,401,176 to Fadavi-Ardenkani ("Fadavi").

The following argument is made pursuant to the Examiner interview of October 19, 2004, for which the agents of record thank the Examiner.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143 (rev. May 2004).

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not teach or suggest all the limitations of any of the claims.

Claim 1 recites a method comprising, "for each of a plurality of channels ... undertaking a given channel processing task for a given channel with one processor ... storing instance data for said given channel processing task in a memory ... such that said instance data is associated with said one processor" [emphasis added]. That is, whenever a plurality of processors are undertaking channel processing tasks, the relationship between instance data for different channel processing tasks and processors is many-to-many. In contrast, Fadavi merely allows one agent at a time to access, as a whole, a shared memory (see, e.g., Column 4, lines 10-13). That is, the relationship

Serial No.: 09/739,714
Art Unit: 2127

between data and processors (agents) in Fadavi is one-to-one. Thus Fadavi cannot be said to teach or suggest the aforementioned claim limitations.

The arguments made in respect of claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 9. Moreover, it is submitted in respect of claim 9 that Fadavi does not disclose a plurality of channel memory partitions, given that the memory in Fadavi is accessed as a whole by only one agent at a time.

Accordingly, as the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Given that the independent claims distinguish over the cited art, the remaining claims, which depend from the independent claims, also distinguish over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing, favourable reconsideration and allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald D. Faggetter
Registration No. 33,345

SMART & BIGGAR
438 University Avenue
Suite 1500, Box 111
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5G 2K8
Telephone: (416) 593-5514
Facsimile: (416) 591-1690

Date: October 25, 2004
RDF/PAE/jbs 92118-57CIP

Page 3 of 3

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.